United Nations A/65/PV.79

General Assembly

Official Records

Sixty-fifth session

79th plenary meeting
Monday, 21 March 2011, 10 a.m.
New York

President: Mr. Deiss ..... (Switzerland)

The meeting was called to order at 10.10 a.m.

Agenda item 133 (*continued*)

Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations (A/65/691/Add.7)

The President (*spoke in French*): Before proceeding to the other items on our agenda, I should like, in keeping with established practice, to draw the attention of the General Assembly to document A/65/691/Add.7, in which the Secretary-General informs the President of the Assembly that, since the issuance of his communication contained in document A/65/691/Add.6, the Dominican Republic and the Gambia have made the necessary payments to reduce their arrears below the amount specified in Article 19 of the Charter.

May I take it that the General Assembly duly takes note of the information contained in that document?

It was so decided.

Agenda items 30 and 109

Report of the Peacebuilding Commission

Report of the Peacebuilding Commission (A/65/701)

Report of the Secretary-General on the Peacebuilding Fund

Report of the Secretary-General on the Peacebuilding Fund (A/65/353)

The President (*spoke in French*): In connection with agenda item 30, members will recall that the General Assembly, by its resolution 65/7, of 29 October 2010, decided to review the progress made in taking forward the relevant recommendations of the report submitted by the co-facilitators, entitled "Review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture" (A/64/868, annex).

The report of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) before the Assembly today attests to the broad range of activities under way during the time period under review. I would especially like to thank Ambassador Peter Wittig for his very skilful conduct of the Commission's work during his term, which has just concluded. I also thank all of the Commission's members for their commitment on behalf of peacebuilding.

Since its inception, in 2005, the Peacebuilding Commission has contributed to integrating the development dimension in the management of post-conflict situations. From Afghanistan to the Sudan and from Burundi to Liberia and the Democratic Republic of the Congo, building and maintaining peace is a difficult task. Building and maintaining peace requires much more than silencing weapons, signing peace agreements or deploying peacekeeping troops, however essential these elements may be. To ensure lasting peace, security must be supported by economic development.

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-506. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

The year 2010 was crucial for the Peacebuilding Commission, since its fourth session coincided with the review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture. The report of the co-facilitators (A/64/868, annex) and the PBC's own report, which is before us today, are critical documents with respect to understanding the outcomes achieved so far and how to improve upon them.

For me, it is particularly welcome that the Chair of the Commission took part in the review work. In that regard, I would like to highlight one particular aspect, namely, the Commission's synergy with other United Nations bodies. The Commission is engaged with the primary bodies of the United Nations, namely, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly. The report submitted to us today highlights the fact that the President of the Commission addressed the Security Council many times, that he took part in thematic debates of the sixty-fourth session of the General Assembly on peacekeeping operations, and that the Commission convened two important events with the Economic and Social Council, one on the food crisis and the other on the Millennium Development Goals in countries emerging from conflict.

That is all well and good, but insufficient. In keeping with the recommendations that emerged from the review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture, we need to enhance our interactions in order to spark greater interest in the Commission's work, strengthen synergies and ensure better results on the ground. A more comprehensive approach is needed in the Peacebuilding Commission's work within the United Nations system to achieve greater coherence in its activities.

I now call on the Assembly to hold its debate in the light of the recommendations of the report on the review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture. As the General Assembly is the most representative and most democratic body of the United Nations, it is necessary to consider how the Assembly may fulfil its commitment to the Commission and, more generally, its commitment to peacebuilding.

Member States possess the human, financial and technical resources to support United Nations efforts to build peace on the ground. In that context, the Assembly can play an important role in increasing the effectiveness of the work of the Commission, thereby contributing to the successful transition of countries emerging from conflict to situations of political stability and social and economic development.

Mr. Wittig (Germany): On behalf of the members of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), I am pleased to present the report of the Commission on its fourth session (A/65/701). Strengthening the peacebuilding agenda, enhancing its impact in the field and providing continued support to the peacebuilding efforts in Burundi, the Central African Republic, Guinea-Bissau and Sierra Leone were at the core of the Commission's work in 2010.

In September 2010, the Commission made Liberia the fifth country on its agenda. Most recently, the Commission responded to the request for advice and support from the Republic of Guinea. That was the first time that such a request was directly submitted to the Commission. In the year 2010, peacebuilding and the future role of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture were very prominently discussed within and outside the United Nations. The review, which was ably guided by my colleagues from Ireland, Mexico and South Africa, offered an opportunity to appreciate the potential of and the challenges facing the Commission. The momentum generated by the 2010 review must be maintained, especially as the Commission further expands its agenda.

The report of the Peacebuilding Commission reflects a collective effort by the members of its Organizational Committee. Progress has been made in addressing recommendations emerging from the 2010 review, in particular in connection with the creation of a new PBC country-specific configuration on Liberia.

The report also reflects the Commission's plan to take forward the recommendations of the review in a way that would facilitate its annual reporting to the General Assembly and the Security Council. The Commission is proceeding in that direction on the basis of a road map of actions in 2011. The road map is focused on meeting practical objectives and making concrete progress in enhancing the Commission's impact on national capacity development and resource mobilization and in aligning key actors behind common peacebuilding objectives.

Allow me to highlight a few elements of the report.

First, the report underscores the Commission's thematic focus during its fourth session, "Partnership for peacebuilding". In view of the complexity of peacebuilding challenges and the multiplicity of actors involved, the need for coherence and partnerships cannot be overemphasized. Building and strengthening partnerships with relevant actors has been identified as a key area of potential value added for the Commission. In that regard, the Organizational Committee devoted most of its efforts and time to engaging the international financial institutions, especially the World Bank, and regional organizations, especially the African Union. The Chair and the Vice-Chairs generally focused on working with a range of potential partners from civil society and academia by holding discussions intended to further deepen awareness and knowledge of the Commission's role and activities.

Secondly, the Commission has given particular priority to strengthening its interactions with the principal organs of the United Nations and its advisory role in that regard. It took steps to generate interest in its work and activities across the membership of the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council. During the reporting period, the Commission witnessed a growing openness and encouraging signs of interest from the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council.

The important thematic debates convened by the Security Council between February 2010 and February 2011 offered recurring opportunities for the Peacebuilding Commission and the United Nations membership and senior leadership to engage with the Council on critical peacebuilding-related policies. The participation of the World Bank in a number of those debates also confirmed the evolving partnership with the Bank at a time when it is further developing its approach to assisting countries emerging from conflict.

Briefings by the Chairs of the country-specific configurations contributed to the Council's periodic consideration of the situations in, and mandates involving, the countries on the Commission's agenda. Most recently, the Council has engaged the Chairs in informal dialogues on the situation in some countries. The outcomes of the thematic debates and the deepening engagement of the Chairs of the PBC's country-specific configurations marked an important step towards more serious consideration by the Council of the Commission's advisory role.

The reporting period also witnessed the continuing development of the Commission's relationship with the Economic and Social Council, through the briefing made by the PBC Chair to the Council's 2010 substantive session. In addition, the Economic and Social Council and the PBC jointly organized a special event on the Millennium Development Goals in countries emerging from conflict. The event attested to the Commission's growing role in advocating an integrated approach to peacebuilding, including through a well-deserved focus on the socio-economic dimension of peacebuilding.

The Commission looks forward to further deepening its linkages with the General Assembly in the future. There is a clear need to bring to bear the Assembly's perspective on the key thematic issues, political and socio-economic alike, under consideration in the Commission.

Thirdly, the Commission continues to receive direct and substantive support from the Peacebuilding Support Office. Notwithstanding its strained capacity, the Office has also been an essential link between the Commission and the operational entities within and outside the United Nations system. The Office has continued to provide regular briefings on the activities and operations of the Peacebuilding Fund. Those briefings helped to deepen understanding of the synergy between the Commission and the Fund in the countries on the Commission's agenda. The recently introduced interaction with the Peacebuilding Fund Advisory Group has provided the Commission with an opportunity to address a number of broad policy issues involving the Fund.

The Fund's resources, combined with the efforts of the Commission, helped to ensure that the countries on the Commission's agenda benefited from the substantial attention and support of the international community, with 64 per cent of total contributions to the Fund being allocated to those countries.

By linking its work to that of peacekeeping, development and political actors in the field, the Peacebuilding Commission has added considerable value. The challenge facing the Commission in demonstrating its full potential, however, is to ensure that its work is backed by a higher level of political commitment from the Member States and senior United Nations leadership. As noted by the co-facilitators in their report on the 2010 review of the United Nations

peacebuilding architecture (A/64/868, annex), the review should be a wake-up call to strengthen the collective resolve to deal with peacebuilding in a more comprehensive and determined way.

I hope that today's debate will take the Assembly a step further towards realizing the full potential of the Commission as an advisory body that is uniquely positioned to help the United Nations meet the challenges it is facing in terms of its collective capacity to deliver on its promises to respond to the needs of millions of people in countries emerging from conflict.

Mr. Gasana (Rwanda): Today's debate represents a unique opportunity for the wider membership of the United Nations to reflect on how we can collectively respond to the plight of millions of people in countries emerging from conflict. While those people have decided to take the path towards peace, that path is usually fraught with enormous challenges.

Historically, the international community has struggled to help countries emerging from conflict meet those challenges. That struggle was caused partly by our inability to understand the complexity of the needs and priorities of the countries concerned, and partly by our inability to sustain attention and focus on those needs and priorities for as long as they deserved.

The Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), the Peacebuilding Fund and the Peacebuilding Support Office were established as dedicated institutional mechanisms to help infuse a new sense of commitment into the cause of sustainable peace. Five years after the Commission, the Fund and the Office started to operate, we can certainly note a qualitative shift in our collective appreciation of the urgent needs of post-conflict societies and the imperative of ensuring a comprehensive and integrated approach to the peacebuilding challenges they face. There is now an urgent need to translate the knowledge and awareness we have developed into operational realities in the field. In my view, we must reflect deeply on whether or not we are capable of taking that essential step towards enabling the Peacebuilding Commission to deliver tangible peace dividends in the field for the people in question.

As my predecessor, the Permanent Representative of Germany, just noted, the Commission has most recently responded to a request for support from the Republic of Guinea, making it the sixth country on the PBC's agenda. The expanding range of countries on the Commission's agenda is not only offering us a wider scope of contributions to peacebuilding, but also adding to the responsibilities, which we must be able to shoulder.

As an advisory body to the General Assembly and the Security Council, the Peacebuilding Commission is not an operational entity similar to traditional United Nations funds and programmes. Rather, it draws enormous political weight and power from the legitimacy it represents and, potentially, the collective commitment of its individual members. I would therefore like to think of today's debate, and of that to be held by the Security Council in two days' time, as presenting opportunities to consider how our individual countries can empower the Commission to exercise its role as a unique political platform for the following five broad functions: first, supporting national stakeholders in projecting their vision for peace and development; secondly, ensuring focused commitments by all actors in support of national ownership and capacity development for national peacebuilding priorities; thirdly, mobilizing resources to fund critical capacities and priorities; fourthly, aligning all actors around common and nationally identified peacebuilding objectives; and, fifthly, promoting mutual accountability between national stakeholders and their regional and international partners.

The recommendations emanating from the recently concluded 2010 review echoed that approach. In addition, the Commission is proceeding on the basis of a road map for actions in 2011, which prioritizes actions around these areas.

As the new Chairperson of the Peacebuilding Commission, I am committed to working with my colleagues the Chairs of the Commission's various groups, the representatives of the countries on the PBC agenda, all Member States, the Peacebuilding Support Office and all relevant United Nations bodies towards achieving tangible progress in taking forward these priority areas. In that respect, allow me to share some reflections on the Commission's planned areas of activities for 2011.

First, I pay tribute to my predecessors, the former Chairs of the PBC, for their commitment to and focus on strengthening partnerships with key actors such as the World Bank, the African Union, the European Union and the African Development Bank. Going forward, the Commission will continue to build on the

progress made so far on this track. The Commission will also continue to explore different approaches to engaging these partners at both the normative and country-specific level of its work.

Similarly, the Commission is planning to proactively engage relevant United Nations departments, agencies, funds and programmes on a range of thematic issues of common interest, such as women's participation in peacebuilding; the impact of rising food prices on countries emerging from conflict; education and youth; and the peacekeeping and peacebuilding nexus.

Secondly, in the same spirit, the PBC is committed to continuing to deepen its interaction with the principal organs of the United Nations. We will build on the important strides made in the relationship with the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council. I also hope that we can place the relationship with the General Assembly on a more dynamic and interactive path. I wish here to thank you personally, Mr. President, for your engagement in that regard. The United Nations contribution to global peacebuilding efforts will certainly be enhanced and further legitimized when the Assembly devotes time to deliberating critical dimensions of the normative development of the concept and the political discourse around it.

Thirdly, I wish to underline the major role that the Secretary-General could play in ensuring system-wide coherence and commitment to peacebuilding, as well as in placing peacebuilding at the core of the United Nations priorities. The Secretary-General's recent reports on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (A/63/881) and women's participation in peacebuilding (A/65/354) have already contributed to the evolution of a more comprehensive and ambitious peacebuilding agenda for the Organization. His continuing engagement with and support for the Commission will certainly help boost our joint efforts to move this agenda forward.

In that regard, we recognize the important role of the Peacebuilding Support Office in linking the activities resulting from the expanding peacebuilding agenda with the work of the Commission. We are also keen to ensure that the Office contributes to deepening our analytical capacity regarding critical peacebuilding priorities, drawing on lessons learned from ongoing and past United Nations experiences relating to these priorities, supporting the development of the Commission's resource mobilization capacity and ensuring synergy between the Commission's engagement with the countries on its agenda and the activities of the Peacebuilding Fund.

(*spoke in French*)

Peacebuilding has taken on renewed momentum since the review of the peacebuilding architecture, both politically and intellectually. However, for our collective efforts in that area to be successful, we must stay the course, especially by mobilizing additional political commitment in order to help populations emerging from conflict to overcome the divisions of the past and have hope in the future. These populations deserve nothing less than our attention and commitment.

Mr. Momen (Bangladesh): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement in the joint debate on the annual report (A/65/701) of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) and the Secretary-General's report on the Peacebuilding Fund (A/65/353).

The Movement wishes to thank you, Mr. President, for organizing this important meeting. We believe that the deliberations in this debate will pave the way for carrying forward the long-held views of Member States on furthering and strengthening the role of the General Assembly in conducting peacebuilding activities. My special thanks go to Ambassador Peter Wittig, former Chair of the PBC, and to the representative of Rwanda, current Chair of the Commission. I would also like to thank the Permanent Representatives members of the PBC review committee, namely, the representatives of Ireland, South Africa and Mexico, for their open, objective and sincere consultations in coming up with good recommendations.

The Movement appreciates the work of the PBC in preparing the annual report delineating its activities during the reporting period. The Movement has also noted with appreciation that the Commission, while preparing that report, took into account the recently concluded review of the peacebuilding architecture. Although the review is not within the purview of regular activity of the Commission, carrying forward its relevant recommendations falls broadly within the context of peacebuilding efforts under the mandate of

the Commission, in cooperation with other entities of the United Nations.

The Movement feels that the report should contain a synopsis outlining a summary of the report in a concise form giving an overview of the whole report. This would have enabled representatives to examine the report in a structured way so that the relevant areas of activity could be considered in synergy with the details in the report.

Turning to specific comments on the report, the Movement would like to see a more structured report that establishes causal relations between what happened and why. In the view of the Movement, the report could include a clear analysis of the Peacebuilding Support Office's actions during the reporting period, so as to provide clear guidance for possible future courses of action for establishing sustainable peace in post-conflict countries. Such logical analysis could establish a clear basis for recommendations for future actions in general and for carrying forward the review's recommendations in particular. I hope that in the future the report will attempt to address such issues in a suitable manner.

With regard to the country-specific configurations, the Movement feels that there should be a general overview for prioritizing activities, including sufficient analysis of background for setting preferences for countries on the PBC agenda. The Movement also feels that the report should contain a concise gap analysis juxtaposing existing scenarios and potential requirements so that sequencing activities in any configuration could be logically framed. In that regard, the report could complement the descriptive/factual listing of all the activities of the country-specific configurations with much needed identification of areas of intersection, mutual expertise and lessons learned between the various configurations.

In the view of the Movement, the analysis and activities of the Commission in the areas of development, particularly in the fields of income-generating activities, job creation and economic revitalization, have not been sufficiently reflected. Although there are references to efforts for youth employment, the report could incorporate more input on views of Member States on other areas of economic revitalization, such as infrastructure development — both tangible and intangible — and empowerment of local people, particularly women, on the ground.

In section III, entitled "Taking forward the relevant recommendations of the 2010 review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture", the report focuses on the areas that have already been addressed by the Commission. In that regard, the Movement would like to see that there has been sufficient reflection of basic principles of peacebuilding activities, which include, among others, national ownership, building national capacities and efforts towards predictable and timely financing of peacebuilding activities. The report could elaborate on how the Commission's activities have contributed in these areas. As we have noted, in the description of events in various areas, such as organized seminars and workshops, the report could elaborate further on the potential impact such events have in achieving the desired objectives.

We have noted with appreciation the Commission's alignment with national strategies for developing a single planning document giving a clear indication of how PBC activities are helping to create national ownership and build national capacities. However, it should further elaborate details on the mode of operation in terms of its real contribution. Similar exercises in other areas, where applicable, would provide a better picture of PBC activities.

We are concerned that the Commission has described its activities only in the area of youth employment under the heading "Developmental aspects of peacebuilding". While we recognize the importance of youth employment as a key developmental aspect, other areas, such as income-generating activities, basic health and education, vocational training and employment of women, cannot be ignored. A fair reflection of all areas, including analysis of strengths and weaknesses in achieving those capacities, would definitely give better guidance for future engagement.

In section IV, the report puts forward conclusions identifying various priorities for increasing the Commission's effectiveness in the field, such as resource mobilization and building partnerships with international financial institutions and regional actors. The Movement feels that the priorities could be further broadened by incorporating more areas, particularly those founded on basic principles of peacebuilding

efforts, such as national capacity-building, the principle of national ownership, South-South cooperation, trilateral cooperation, strengthening the role of the PBC, and engaging women and civil society. It is important that the Commission's annual report contain recommendations on the way forward for the Commission and its activities during the year to come — building on previous achievements and addressing the identified gaps, in such a way that the work and activities of the Commission acquire a cumulative nature, which will enable it to fulfil its responsibilities and achieve its goals and objectives.

Turning to the Secretary-General's report on the Peacebuilding Fund, the Movement agrees with the findings of the study that the Fund is a critical instrument for dealing with peacebuilding activities. However, we believe that the Fund needs to be handled properly, with the utmost efficiency and transparency, in order to achieve its desired goals. In that regard, the Movement wishes to see the Peacebuilding Support Office put forward its best efforts to make it a fast, relevant and catalytic instrument for establishing sustainable peace by preventing relapses into violent conflict.

As of 30 June 2010, total contributions to the Fund had increased by almost 10.5 per cent, from $309 million in June 2009 to $342 million in June 2010. We thank the Member States that have participated in this valuable contribution. We also urge other Member States in a position to do so to contribute to the cause of establishing sustainable peace and security. We also note that use of the Fund has increased, from 45.6 per cent in June 2009 to 59.9 per cent in June 2010.

However, it does not seem that the Fund is being optimally used overall. We therefore urge the Secretariat to intensify its efforts to work more closely with relevant stakeholders, particularly representatives of host countries, to ensure greater, more effective and more efficient use of the Peacebuilding Fund so that it fulfils its purpose of achieving sustainable peace. We also urge the Secretariat to further intensify its cooperation to broaden the donor base so that attainable peace is not held hostage to a paucity of funds that were not mobilized owing to insufficient coordination.

Furthermore, there is an urgent need to clarify our vision with respect to the relationship between the Peacebuilding Commission and Peacebuilding Fund. In spite of the Fund's independence, further improvements, under the authority of the Secretary-General, are required to enhance coordination and coherence between its activities and the funding programmes for projects being implemented in the countries on the agenda of the Peacebuilding Commission. The role of the Commission in providing guidance for the Fund's policies, which are to be implemented under the supervision of the administrative agent, should also be assessed. Those issues must be further discussed while taking forward the recommendations of the review of the Commission.

As we have mentioned repeatedly, post-conflict peacebuilding activities should be conducted through intense and effective consultations among the main organs of the United Nations, such as the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council, in coordination with the PBC. In today's context, it is the General Assembly. As the various entities cooperate and coordinate, sufficient attention needs to be given to representational inclusiveness.

Just as it is difficult to establish the direct cause of a conflict, it is also difficult to incorporate experiences and expertise into efforts to address the problem. Hence, assimilating the views of the broader United Nations membership in peacebuilding activities will pave the way for duplicating and contextualizing diverse nation-building experiences in peacebuilding efforts. The Movement therefore agrees with the recommendations of the co-facilitators of the review of the peacebuilding architecture that the co-parenting role of the General Assembly should be more visible and meaningful. The Movement is always ready to extend necessary support and cooperation wherever and whenever needed.

Finally, let me conclude by reiterating the Movement's assurances of constructive and meaningful engagement in all future peacebuilding activities.

Mr. Kőrösi (Hungary): I thank you, Sir, for giving the floor to the European Union. The candidate countries Turkey, Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Montenegro; the countries of the Stabilisation and Association Process and potential candidates Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Serbia; as well as Ukraine align themselves with this declaration.

Supporting countries emerging from conflict is a moral obligation and the responsibility of the international community. We cannot fail to meet this challenge. The United Nations, with its global legitimacy and broad range of instruments, has a key role to play in helping to build lasting peace. That is why the European Union has been actively engaged in the work of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) since its creation six years ago.

In recent months, we have taken important steps to strengthen our support to countries emerging from conflict. We have held important debates and concrete initiatives are under way to enhance the coherence and the effectiveness of our engagement. In the same vein, the PBC has continued to raise the awareness of the international community about the countries on the Commission's agenda and has proven its added value in different situations. The supportive political role played by the PBC during the elections in Burundi and its active role in Sierra Leone to foster job creation and create economic opportunities are good examples.

The European Union is also encouraged to see that two new countries, Liberia and Guinea, have decided to put themselves forward for referral. Moreover, two very important reviews have been carried out.

The first review (see S/2011/85) pertains to the deployment of civilian capacity and was conducted by the Senior Advisory Group, chaired by Mr. Jean-Marie Guéhenno. The review is a key contribution towards ensuring the deployment of more flexible, demand-driven and better-qualified civilian expertise in a timely fashion on the ground with a view to helping national actors build their own capacity in peacebuilding-related areas.

The European Union attaches great importance to the follow-up of the recommendations, and we hope that the review will result in the increased global availability of civilian experts for post-conflict situations and in the seamless interoperability of civilian capacities within the United Nations system and between the United Nations and other key players, such as the regional organizations.

Another important point for the European Union is the enhanced deployment of female civilian experts in the spirit of Security Council resolution 1325 (2000) and the Secretary-General's action plan on ensuring women's participation in peacebuilding (see S/2010/466). Post-conflict institutions cannot be effective without gender equality. The PBC should play an important role in championing the civilian capacity review.

The second review is the 2010 PBC review (see S/2010/393, annex) carried out by the three co-facilitators. The result is a very thoughtful assessment of the PBC architecture, which brought forward numerous ambitious recommendations to increase the impact of that body.

The time to look ahead is now. We need to capitalize on the political momentum generated by the 2010 PBC review process by utilizing all means at our disposal to face the numerous challenges ahead. Those challenges include the electoral processes in the Central African Republic and Liberia, the reform of the security sector in Guinea-Bissau and Guinea, and the promotion of youth opportunities in Sierra Leone, to mention but a few examples.

In all of these scenarios, the PBC can and must make a difference. In order to deliver, we need to redouble our efforts and strive for a more relevant PBC, underpinned by genuine national ownership across the board. Hence, improvements have to be made in the field and at Headquarters through better analysis, a sharper focus on the key bottlenecks to peace in a given country, and the establishment of mutual commitments between the Government and the international community to address those difficulties. All of that will put the PBC in a much better position to achieve results, as will the proposals for the PBC to take a flexible approach to its country work.

To conclude, as a strong believer in peacebuilding, the European Union stands ready to intensify its efforts and enable the United Nations peacebuilding architecture to live up to the expectations that accompanied its establishment.

Mrs. Viotti (Brazil): Brazil thanks you, Sir, for convening this debate on the annual report (A/65/701) of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC). We appreciate the possibility of discussing, in the broad setting of the General Assembly, the work undertaken by the Commission in the past year and a half. I also take this opportunity to thank Ambassador Peter Wittig for his excellent leadership in 2010 as Chair of the PBC, which we greatly appreciated. We wish Ambassador Gasana every success in his endeavours and pledge our full support to him.

Last year was marked by the review process of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture. We express our appreciation to the three facilitators. The recommendations they made offer useful guidance for our future activities and will enhance the PBC's effectiveness on the ground. It is our responsibility to take them forward. My delegation looks forward to continuing this discussion in the Commission and in other bodies relevant to its work.

In spite of the progress made, many difficult challenges lie ahead. They arise from the very nature of peacebuilding, which requires concerted action and strong commitments from national actors and the international community alike in fragile environments and through processes that do not always follow a linear path.

I will briefly address three areas in which, we believe, further progress may be obtained: the integrated and multidimensional nature of peacebuilding, partnerships, and relationships with other relevant United Nations bodies.

Building peace requires a long-term and sustained effort in a variety of fields. While initial challenges usually relate to security and stability, economic and social actions must not be relegated to a later stage. All of those goals are mutually reinforcing and should therefore be pursued simultaneously within an integrated framework. It is not possible to achieve sustained stability without economic and social progress, and the opposite is equally true. Helping countries emerging from conflict to restore the provision of basic services, re-establish core functions of public administration, revitalize the economy and fight poverty is an effective way to achieve long-lasting peace, security and stability. Those countries have repeatedly expressed their opinion that social and developmental aspects are urgent priorities for them.

The international community should heed this call and adapt its assistance to those national priorities, alongside the support already given in areas such as justice and security. The international community should also focus on helping countries to build and strengthen their institutions. Those institutions are indispensable to enhancing national ownership and will allow for stronger public administration.

For example, in the case of Guinea-Bissau, progress made in the areas of economic management and public finance, with the support of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, contributed to economic growth and increased fiscal revenue. Approval of debt relief within the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries Debt Initiative, and which was advocated by the PBC country-specific configuration, will create better conditions for the Government to manage its budget and to start investing in important peacebuilding priorities, such as security sector reform and provision of basic services. This is just one example of how institution-building and economic recovery might, through an integrated approach, impact positively on the security situation.

Another important aspect of this integrated approach must be support for policies to empower women. Our experiences within the Guinea-Bissau configuration have consistently shown that the active participation of women in the political and economic fields is crucial to peacebuilding and restoring war-torn societies. The contributions women can offer are numerous. In agriculture, for example, they can further economic revitalization and secure the livelihood of their families.

Youth employment is another matter of concern and an area where the PBC configurations are striving to achieve meaningful results. In Guinea-Bissau, hundreds of young people have been trained in various skills with resources provided by the Peacebuilding Fund. We could not agree more with the stress placed by the Permanent Representative of Bangladesh, on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement, on the need to integrate other development aspects besides youth employment — such as income-generating activities, basic health care and education, vocational training and the employment of women — into peacebuilding strategies. We are convinced that only sustained and multidimensional efforts focused on the root causes of conflicts will create the necessary conditions for the long-term progress and stability of countries emerging from conflict.

The PBC should continue to seek enhanced partnerships with a variety of actors. Reaching out to regional and subregional organizations is also indispensable to galvanizing the support of neighbouring countries in tackling common challenges, as well as in exchanging experiences. In West Africa, for example, the Economic Community of West African States has been a pivotal actor in shoring up our activities. It is clear that our course of action must

be outlined not only in New York, but also in close coordination with stakeholders in the affected region.

We echo the calls for better interaction between the PBC and the principal United Nations organs. The PBC would greatly benefit from an enhanced dialogue with the Economic and Social Council on the social and economic aspects of peacebuilding, besides achieving greater transparency and effectiveness in its actions. The same goes for the Security Council, which we think should resort more often to the advice of the PBC when discussing the mandates of missions in countries on the Commission's agenda.

In February, during the Brazilian presidency, the Security Council held an interactive dialogue on the United Nations Integrated Office in Burundi with the Chair of the country-specific configuration, Ambassador Paul Seger. We hope that such initiatives will continue. We have seen in our work the importance of partnerships with the international financial institutions. We will continue to strive for enhanced interaction with those institutions.

More than a compilation of activities, the annual report of the PBC is a good reference to define what additional steps should be taken to improve its results. We could not agree more with the conclusion that the Commission should concentrate on improving its effectiveness in the field. Linking with actors on the ground and with national stakeholders must remain a concern of all of us.

Brazil is committed to doing its best to help to improve the transparency, legitimacy and effectiveness of the PBC with a focus on fostering national ownership, supporting the development of local capacities and assisting the countries emerging from conflict to advance on a sustainable path towards stability and development.

Sir Mark Lyall Grant (United Kingdom): I would like to thank you, Sir, for organizing this debate, which provides a useful opportunity to take stock of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) and Peacebuilding Fund (PBF). I would first like to give particular thanks to Ambassador Wittig for his dedicated efforts in chairing the Organizational Committee. I would also like to thank the Permanent Representatives of Canada, Belgium, Brazil, Jordan, Nepal and Switzerland and their respective teams for their chairing roles, and the Peacebuilding Support Office for its support.

The annual report (A/65/701) describes a number of achievements the PBC made during the past year in its central, country-based work. They include the PBC's support to the elections in Burundi and the Central African Republic, where it has also helped maintain momentum behind the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration process. We welcome the joint meetings that have been held on drugs and youth unemployment, which have helped to galvanize thinking and action across the West African region. The PBC's rapid take-up and engagement with Liberia has been impressive, and there are useful lessons for other country engagements.

But there are some areas where less progress has been made. They include Guinea-Bissau, where peacebuilding has been stymied as a result of the political and security situation. The PBC review was also an important milestone last year, and I would like to thank the Permanent Representatives of Ireland, Mexico and South Africa for their report. The most important set of recommendations that came out of that process are those concerned with improving the PBC's impact on the countries on its agenda.

For the year ahead, under the leadership of the Rwandan Permanent Representative, Ambassador Gasana, we need to see the fruits of this. We need to see genuine progress in the implementation of the Economic Community of West African States road map on security sector reform in Guinea-Bissau, the establishment of regional justice hubs in Liberia, and rapid agreement on the commitments between the Government and the international community for addressing the bottlenecks to peace in Guinea, notably in security sector reform.

But it is important to underline that we cannot simply sit back and hope that the respective country Chairs deliver results. As noted in the PBC review, we each have a responsibility — whether bilaterally or through our representation on United Nations organs, regional organizations or international financial institutions — to support the Chairs in their efforts. The United Kingdom reiterates its commitment to helping ensure that such progress is made. It is only by achieving results that the PBC will become an influential and critical part of the international peacebuilding architecture.

This year, the PBC can also play a key role in championing the civilian capacity review. We also

think that the Commission should link up with the new grouping of 17 fragile and conflict-affected countries to take on board their assessment of the international community's peacebuilding performance, which will emerge during the course of the year.

The Peacebuilding Fund also has an important part to play. The United Kingdom's Department for International Development has recently completed a review of the PBF as part of its multilateral aid review. Overall, the findings of the PBF review were positive, and the Fund was considered to have performed well against the review's criteria. In light of this result, I am pleased to announce that the Department for International Development will make a new contribution to the Fund of more than $40 million over the next two years.

I would like to congratulate Judy Cheng-Hopkins and her team on the significant progress made in improving the management of the Fund. There are, however, areas where the PBF still requires significant improvement. These include demonstrating that it is achieving concrete results and controlling costs, while at the same time ensuring that it remains flexible and adds value as a catalytic, system-wide instrument.

Mr. Tarar (Pakistan): I thank you, Sir, for convening today's debate. I also thank the Permanent Representative of Germany for ably guiding the work of the Organizational Committee of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) in 2010 and extend our best wishes to the current Chair, the Permanent Representative of Rwanda.

The fourth session of the PBC, covered in the annual report under consideration (A/65/701), was a landmark not only for the Commission but also for United Nations peacebuilding endeavours as a whole. In that regard, I will mention three areas of particular significance.

First, having completed its first five years, the PBC conducted a first review of its work, as mandated in its founding resolution 60/180. The Permanent Representatives of Ireland, Mexico and South Africa made commendable efforts as co-facilitators of the review process. As we take forward the recommendations of that process this year, we believe that key areas of focus should include strict prioritization of targeted areas, focusing on security sector reform, local capacity-building and economic revitalization; a sharper emphasis on the development aspects of peacebuilding; and fine-tuning the linkage between peacekeeping and peacebuilding. Similarly, aligning the strategic frameworks for countries on the PBC's agenda with respective national priorities and policies, under complete local ownership, is important to ensure successful peacebuilding efforts.

Secondly, interest in the work of the PBC increased as country-specific configurations refined their roles. Individual configurations undertook important initiatives in resource mobilization and developing synergies with international financial institutions.

Thirdly, a better understanding of the challenges and complexities of peacebuilding efforts developed last year as countries like Burundi and Sierra Leone successfully managed their progress on the road to sustainable peace. Similarly, Liberia entered into its partnership with the PBC following the success of the United Nations Mission in Liberia in extinguishing the fires of conflict and war. Those experiences will go a long way towards constructing a consensual discourse on peacebuilding at the global level and creating templates for successful peacebuilding strategies to be applied in post-conflict zones.

The success of United Nations peacebuilding endeavours hinges on financial resources. In this context, the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) provided the seed money in a post-conflict situation to attract other sources of finance. The PBF is an essential component of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture. The Secretary-General has set a target of disbursing $100 million each year in the next three years from the PBF. We believe that this target is commensurate with the challenges ahead. Achieving it will require donations from Member States, which have been aptly characterized as an investment in peace.

The PBF has been criticized for lacking transparency and a proper monitoring or evaluation system, as well as for making slow disbursements. While most of these concerns are valid to some extent, understaffing in the PBF's management is one of the plausible causes. Member States and the Secretariat should provide the Fund with the human resources and operational flexibility needed to make it more efficient. We are happy to note that, during the most recent pledging session, held in November, more than 30 countries pledged contributions. Pakistan also

contributed to the Fund, despite financial constraints resulting from the worst floods in our history.

Pakistan is a founding member of the Organizing Committee of the PBC. In 2003 and 2004, Pakistan proposed the creation of an ad hoc composite committee for peacebuilding. Two years later, that proposal crystallized into the PBC. Over the past five years, we have actively contributed to the Commission's work. As the largest contributor of troops to United Nations peacekeeping missions, Pakistan has a vital stake in successful peacebuilding efforts. We hope that, with our collective efforts, the peacebuilding architecture of the United Nations will become a strong citadel of hope for the conflict-ridden people of the world.

Mr. Kleib (Indonesia): I would like to begin by thanking you, Sir, for having convened this joint debate to deliberate on the two important reports before us. In this regard, we express our deep appreciation to the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) for its annual report (A/65/701) and to the Secretary-General for his report (A/65/353) on the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF).

We wish to thank Ambassador Peter Wittig of Germany, who served as Chair of the Commission in 2010. Under his able chairmanship, we saw the Commission go through an evolution in its focus on its efforts to improve its impact in the field. We commend, among other things, the outreach activities with key partners, promoting a better understanding of the Commission.

Indonesia associates itself with the statement delivered by the representative of Bangladesh on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement caucus in the PBC.

As a member of the PBC, Indonesia is very pleased to see both the Commission and the Fund progress in the achievement of their respective mandates. The work of the Organizational Committee and the country configurations — which, with the addition of Guinea, now number six — demonstrates the Commission's dedication and commitment to bettering the countries in on the PBC agenda and to enhancing global attention to and support for post-conflict peacebuilding as a key issue of our times.

It is heartening to learn that in the United Nations system, including in the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council, there have been numerous important discussions over the past year on various aspects of post-conflict peacebuilding. We welcome these increased interactions, which need to be continued and nurtured. We hope that this greater focus on peacebuilding will not only enable greater collaboration among the United Nations organs, but will also allow for strengthened partnerships with relevant entities outside the United Nations system.

Effective peacebuilding demands a comprehensive approach and the General Assembly, with its wide-ranging purview, is a very appropriate forum to examine how the international community can improve its post-conflict response and, in that regard, how the PBC and PBF can be further strengthened and supported.

Both reports outline many important directions, and Indonesia fully agrees with the core point that post-conflict efforts must be nationally identified, nationally owned and nationally driven, but with full and sustained assistance from the United Nations, the region and international community.

With regard to the PBC, my delegation would like to dwell on the following few points. First, it is critical that the peacekeeping-peacebuilding nexus be reflected on the ground from the very outset. No two situations are similar, yet the overwhelming evidence from countries emerging from conflict shows that efforts to build and nurture local and national institutions and to foster economic development, security, the rule of law, justice, governance, and other essential services must be made while the peacekeeping process is still in progress. The early development of domestic capacities in such areas solidifies the foundations upon which any broader peacebuilding depends.

In this context, Indonesia welcomes the recent release of the independent report commissioned by the Secretary-General on the civilian capacity in the immediate aftermath of conflict (A/65/747). We look forward to actively participating in both the deliberation of this important report and in taking forward its recommendations.

We are also of the view that the review should focus, as many have emphasized, on efforts to create needs-based civilian capacities mechanisms, in which the expertise comes primarily from the States concerned, the region, the South and women. The PBC, with its vast experience, knowledge and diverse

membership, should explore how it can build greater support for and facilitate the fulfilment of civilian capacities for peacebuilding activities, in support of countries emerging from conflict, especially to countries on its agenda.

Secondly, it is very important that the PBC also continue to take forward the relevant recommendations of the 2010 review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture. In this context, the pertinent bodies of the United Nations, including the General Assembly, should also enhance their parenting and backing of the PBC. We support the Commission's approach of using a practical mechanism to track the progress made in implementing the report's recommendations. Indonesia will do its part to contribute to the realization of the recommendations.

Thirdly, we concur with the PBC that there is a need for a single overall planning document. A single national peacebuilding document outlining strategies and priorities developed by the host Government would improve coordination among the national and international partners concerned. It would also simplify the monitoring and documentation requirements for the Governments of post-conflict countries. This single document would help in the development of expeditious, more focused and coherent engagement frameworks by the Commission. It would further enable early support, more closely built on and aligned with national priorities. In this regard, we appreciate the work done with respect to Sierra Leone, the Central African Republic, Burundi and, more recently, Liberia.

Fourthly, Indonesia considers the PBC's mandated task of marshalling resources to be central to the Commission's work in continuing to prove its added value with concrete, country-specific results. In this respect, we welcome and support the efforts of the PBC to bolster its partnerships with the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund and regional financial institutions. We note that the Organizational Committee and Working Group on Lessons Learned have also explored innovative sources of funding from private capital.

Indonesia, during its membership of the Commission in 2008, had the privilege to facilitate the first-ever PBC task force on the private sector's role in post-conflict peacebuilding. The task force produced consensus recommendations on how to engage in particular with non-traditional actors in the private sector. It is our expectation that the outcome of the PBC task force will be utilized to forge partnerships, yielding further financial and non-financial benefits for the countries on the Commission's agenda. Indonesia stands ready to continue making its contribution to the realization of the task force recommendations.

With regard to the Peacebuilding Fund, Indonesia is pleased to note that the Fund is now generating benefits in 16 countries, with one of the broadest donor bases among the United Nations multi-donor trust funds. This signifies the Fund's importance internationally, as well as the expectation that it will produce quick and robust peace dividends. We expect the efficiency and impact of the Fund to increase further.

We note that efforts have been made to enhance consultation with the PBC and to report regularly. There also needs to be greater involvement and policy advice from the General Assembly. We welcome the steps to improve the monitoring of the Fund's operations, and expect that the implementation rate of the Fund's projects will be commensurate with its growing role. The combination of the short-term Immediate Response Facility and the longer-term country-determined Peacebuilding and Recovery Facility has given the needed flexibility to the Fund. But it remains imperative that the work of the Fund be fully aligned with the priority plans of the respective countries.

Let me conclude by underling the importance of regular interaction, cooperation and coherence among the PBC, the PBF, the Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO), the Department for Political Affairs, the United Nations Development Programme and other relevant actors of the United Nations system. The multiplicity of factors in post-conflict conditions can be addressed effectively only if the relevant United Nations units work with synergy. Furthermore, as the nexus of peacebuilding and peacekeeping becomes greater, it is essential that a sustained effort be made to encourage and institute greater communication and collaboration between the PBC and the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations, on the one hand, and the PBSO and the Department for Peacekeeping Operations, on the other.

Mr. Grauls (Belgium) (*spoke in French*): At the outset, I wish to thank Ambassador Wittig and his team for their dynamic leadership of the Organizational

Committee during the period covered by the report of the Peacebuilding Commission before us today (A/65/701). I also convey my greetings to his successor, Ambassador Gasana, whom I wish a successful year.

Belgium aligns itself with the statement delivered on behalf of the European Union, and I will not repeat what has already been said in that regard. I do wish, however, to make some brief remarks in my national capacity in the light of my experience as Chair of the Central African Republic country-specific configuration of the Peacebuilding Commission.

The past year gave us the opportunity to take stock of the peacebuilding architecture five years after its creation. The diagnosis and outcome of the review of this young, fast-growing structure are that, despite its growing pains and learning curve, it possesses the potential to mobilize the attention, support and resources that are indispensable to countries emerging from crisis.

Over the past year, the five-year review of the Peacebuilding Commission mobilized significant resources and capacities. Belgium therefore encourages all interested parties to assume their responsibilities forthwith on the basis of the excellent recommendations of the co-facilitators, whom I wish to take this opportunity to thank once again. More specifically, we call on the parent bodies of the Peacebuilding Commission to give it the means and attention its mandate requires.

With regard to the Peacebuilding Support Office, we hope above all that it will henceforth devote a greater proportion of its staff and activities to directly supporting the countries on the agenda of the Commission. We call on the United Nations system as a whole to take account of the coordination and facilitation role entrusted to the Support Office. Finally, we encourage all of the members of the Commission to collaborate more closely within the country-specific configurations in support of the countries on the agenda.

For its part, the Central African Republic configuration has integrated the recommendations of the five-year review into its programme of work by setting seven priority objectives: first, to strengthen the links between our configuration and the Security Council and the General Assembly; secondly, to strengthen the links among the three pillars of the peacebuilding architecture and with the rest of the United Nations system supporting the Central African Republic; thirdly, to support the alignment of peacebuilding partners through joint strategic planning tools; fourthly, to strengthen the capacities of the national Government and civil society; fifthly, to build our own resource mobilization capacity; sixthly, reconsider the presence of our configuration in the country and its visibility on the ground; and, finally, to draw up on the lessons learned by other country-specific configurations.

My delegation also notes with satisfaction the considerable improvements made by the Secretariat in terms of the speed, effectiveness and impact of the Peacebuilding Fund. We must note, however, that the catalytic aspect of the Fund still requires a great deal of attention. Here, better use of the potential synergy between the Fund and the Commission could undoubtedly contribute to further mobilizing bilateral partners around jointly identified peacebuilding priorities.

I conclude by recalling the active commitment and solidarity of Belgium in favour of peacebuilding, including through its various contributions to the United Nations peacebuilding architecture.

Ms. Okai (Japan): It is my great pleasure to address the General Assembly under the presidency of His Excellency Mr. Joseph Deiss during this debate on the report (A/65/701) of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) and the report of the Secretary-General (A/65/353) on the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF). I would like to express Japan's gratitude to the former Chair of the PBC, His Excellency Mr. Peter Wittig, for his in-depth report and his able leadership of the work of the PBC during the year 2010.

At the outset, I would like to take this opportunity to touch upon the massive earthquake and tsunami that occurred recently in Japan. The Government of Japan and our people are making every possible effort to recover from the aftermath of these catastrophic events. I express my sincere gratitude for the heartfelt condolences and assistance extended to Japan by many countries, international organizations and other members of the international community in an effort to help us overcome the tragedy. We are convinced that, with the support of our partners, we will be able to overcome the daunting challenges currently confronting us.

Japan believes that the activities of the PBC during its fourth session, including the five-year review and the establishment of a country-specific configuration of the PBC for Liberia, were of particular significance. Looking ahead, I would like to offer a few points that Japan considers important in advancing the activities of the Commission.

First, one of the priority issues for the PBC under the leadership of the new Chair, His Excellency Mr. Eugène-Richard Gasana, is to consider how we can best take forward the recommendations of the review in order to yield a tangible impact on the ground, including in the six countries on the PBC's agenda. Japan, in its capacity as the new Chair of the Working Group on Lessons Learned, intends to actively engage the Working Group to contribute to the implementation of the recommendations of the review and to the strengthening of the added value of the PBC. As we have already informed the members of the PBC, the Working Group is aiming to make concrete proposals on issues relevant to the advancement of the recommendations of the PBC review, including resource mobilization on priorities, economic revitalization, youth employment, the modality of the PBC's engagement in forthcoming agenda countries, and the strengthening of the relationship between the PBC and the Security Council.

Secondly, at the upcoming meeting of the Working Group on Lessons Learned, Japan, as Chair, intends to highlight the issue of coordination in effective resource mobilization for peacebuilding priorities. For better resource mobilization and coordination, it is essential that peacebuilding priorities be shared and promoted through an integrated approach, especially among host Governments, the United Nations country teams, the PBF and international partners, including the World Bank.

Most importantly, we believe that this integrated approach must be facilitated by strong leadership on the ground. The Working Group will examine whether the respective country configurations have succeeded in this endeavour and identify the obstacles in cases in which countries are having difficulties. Through this exercise, we intend to make proposals as to what steps the PBC and relevant stakeholders may wish to take in moving forward.

Thirdly, with regard to the financial situation of the PBF, it is encouraging to see the steady expansion of the donor base. Expectations of the PBF have also expanded because of the increase in the number of eligible countries and additional allocations to existing recipients. As one of the Fund's major contributors, the Government of Japan will make an additional contribution of $12.5 million to the PBF in 2011.

The unique role of the PBF is to have a catalytic effect to address critical gaps in the peacebuilding process, in particular in areas for which no other funding mechanism is available. Since its establishment, the PBF has addressed, as a catalytic instrument, the immediate needs of countries emerging from or at risk of relapsing into conflict under different circumstances.

It is Japan's view that, given the flexibility and rapid response capability of the PBF, its allocations should be focused more closely on needs that may not be covered by other resources. We believe that the PBF will achieve higher value through more effective utilization of its limited resources if partners can attain a stronger shared recognition of appropriate allocation of resources in proper sequence. As the Chair of the Working Group on Lessons Learned, we also intend to take up this issue in the upcoming meeting.

I conclude my remarks today by reiterating Japan's continuing commitment to working closely with members and partners of the Peacebuilding Commission, including the General Assembly, for the improvement of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture.

Ms. Taracena Secaira (Guatemala) (*spoke in Spanish*): As a country that has recently joined the Peacebuilding Commission, we thank you, Mr. President, for convening this joint debate and for circulating the report of the Peacebuilding Commission (A/65/701) and the report of the Secretary-General on the Peacebuilding Fund (A/65/353). We also thank the former Chair of the Commission, Ambassador Peter Wittig, for the cogent briefing he gave us this morning on the Commission's fourth session and for the road map he has proposed for its future activities. We welcome the progress described in that presentation.

We also thank the Permanent Representatives of Ireland, Mexico and South Africa for their work and for showing us the way towards achieving greater relevance and added value in the Commission's work. We wish Ambassador Gasana of Rwanda every success in his work this year.

Like other representatives who have spoken before us, we believe that the Commission has already demonstrated its usefulness in the constellation of available intergovernmental forums. It has especially shown its potential for ensuring greater consistency in the decisions of the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council. We agree with the idea often repeated here today that much more can still be done to improve the work of the Commission. As a new member of the Commission and its Organizational Committee, we are committed to doing everything possible to contribute to a successful fifth session.

Among its many virtues is the Commission's intrinsic approach of focusing on specific situations rather than on general concepts and on particular actions rather than on universal ideas. We have repeatedly called for increased cooperation between the United Nations and multilateral financial institutions, because the Commission has the greatest potential to give genuine and effective substance to the work of all United Nations bodies, in its broadest sense, and to help them operate in a coordinated and coherent fashion.

We especially value the work of the country configurations, which are the forums in which the principle of peacebuilding and its implementation in specific instances truly come together. Even though it is now trite to say that we must avoid one-size-fits-all remedies, it is absolutely true that every circumstance is unique and requires policies and actions that respond to its uniqueness.

As newcomers in that body, we continue to entertain lingering doubts about the criteria for selecting country configurations. It is only logical that our organizational capacities and limited human and financial resources make a selection process necessary, but should we choose those countries most in need of a proactive agent like the United Nations, or should we choose countries with the greatest potential for success? Should it be a combination of the two? Let us recall that the very idea of peacebuilding involves the concept of transition or graduation, if necessary, during which the target countries develop to the point where they no longer require our presence, freeing us to take on other cases.

We have two further comments. The first has to do with the relationship between the Organizational Committee to the country configurations. On a number of occasions, we have seen all the Chairs of the country configurations speak through a single spokesperson, usually one of the Chairs, rather than through the Chair of the Organizational Committee. We believe that the highest authority among the three iterations of the entire Commission is the Chair of the Organizational Committee, whose role includes coordinating the work of the country configurations and the Working Group on Lessons Learned.

Our second comment concerns the great utility of the Peacebuilding Fund. My own country was recently assisted by the Fund in strengthening the institutionalization of the security and justice sectors. What is interesting in this support from the Fund is that the Guatemalan peace accords were signed almost 15 years ago, and yet remnants of the conflict remain as obstacles to achieving a solid rule of law and which, at least in theory, could provoke a backsliding towards renewed conflict. This highlights the wisdom of having two Facilities in the Fund — one for the short term and another for the medium and long terms.

Finally, we understand that the Security Council will discuss the report on 23 March, when it could focus on how to continue to develop its relationship with the PBC, make better use of its advisory capacity, improve its interaction with country-specific configurations, and ensure that the innovations of the PBC and the United Nations peacebuilding architecture are reflected in the Council's work. I believe that this would lead to greater coherency in the efforts of the main organs of the United Nations and the scope of their activities in specific countries.

Mr. McNee (Canada): As a committed member of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) and a major donor to the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF), Canada welcomes the progress made by both institutions. As its annual report illustrates (A/65/701), the Peacebuilding Commission has evolved considerably over the course of its lifespan, with much innovation and experimentation coming in the past two years. In this light, allow me to briefly speak to four areas that deserve continued attention.

First, the PBC needs to maintain a flexible, multitiered approach. The country-configuration model has proved an effective means of engaging with countries recovering from conflict. The inclusion of Liberia and Guinea on the Peacebuilding

Commission's agenda not only demonstrates progress, but also further underscores the need to adjust to each post-conflict context. The PBC must continue to put this approach into practice, including by further refining its lighter forms of engagement.

Secondly, Canada stresses the importance of closer cooperation with field-level peacebuilding. The Commission's engagement must be aligned with existing national strategies and complementary to the work of relevant peacebuilding actors on the ground. In this respect, Canada welcomes recent attempts to draw more effectively on the national resources available within the full membership of the country configurations.

Thirdly, the proliferation of peacebuilding actors reinforces the need for a thematic focal point to bring coherence and impetus to broader peacebuilding efforts. The Peacebuilding Commission can productively enhance its role as a forum for supporting reform processes, sharing best practices and debating outstanding institutional challenges. In this respect, support for the implementation of the review of international civilian capacities and progress on the immediate aftermath of conflict will be particularly valuable. Better fulfilling this role will require an increased willingness to draw on expertise resident within the wider peacebuilding community. As its experience builds, the Commission will be also be better placed to systematize the lessons learned from its own work.

Finally, the Commission must continue to develop stronger partnerships with other peacebuilding actors, including regional organizations, the international financial institutions and civil society. This is also true within the United Nations, where there is an enduring need for closer relationships with the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council and the Security Council. In Canada's view, enhanced cooperation between the Security Council and Peacebuilding Commission holds particular promise. Building on recent interactive discussions, a more effective working relationship between the two bodies based on a clearer mutual understanding of the Commission's role should continue to be explored.

Canada congratulates the Peacebuilding Fund for the many contributions, amply demonstrated in the Secretary-General's report, it has made towards supporting and building sustainable peace. Canada supports the work of the Peacebuilding Fund and has contributed $25 million to its operations since its inception in 2006. Further, Canada, as part of its multi-year funding agreement signed last year, will contribute $5 million to the Fund in 2011, with a further $5 million planned for 2012.

(*spoke in French*)

Though the Fund's long-term impact on peacebuilding cannot yet be fully assessed, Canada is encouraged by an increased focus on results and reporting. Assessing and evaluating the impacts of peacebuilding interventions is key to ensuring that the Fund is indeed making a meaningful contribution to sustainable peace. Canada supports, inter alia, the Peacebuilding Fund's efforts to strengthen its strategic focus and purpose. We would further welcome renewed clarification on the Fund's unique catalytic role and unique comparative advantage within broader United Nations peacebuilding efforts. Canada also underscores the continuing need to more closely examine the links between the Fund's activities and those of other humanitarian and development funding mechanisms in order to achieve maximum impact and avoid the duplication of efforts.

Finally, Canada welcomes the Peacebuilding Fund's efforts to address the challenges it faces, and encourages the Fund to continue learning strategic lessons from its growing experience.

In closing, let me highlight the importance of building on the progress made so far. The expansion in scope of the Peacebuilding Commission's agenda and the increasing sophistication of the Peacebuilding Fund's activities clearly show the need for the members of that body to continue to focus on strengthening the United Nations peacebuilding architecture. Finally, Canada stands ready to play an active role in advancing this agenda.

Mr. Vilović (Croatia): At the outset, I would like to thank you, Mr. President, for having organized this important and timely debate. I would also like to thank Ambassador Wittig for his presentation of the 2010 report (A/65/701) of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) and to congratulate him and his team for their excellent chairmanship of the PBC last year.

Croatia aligns itself with the statement delivered earlier in this debate on behalf of the European Union.

With respect to peacekeeping and peacebuilding concepts, underlying ideas and existing practices, the past year was undoubtedly exceptionally dynamic and revealing. A thorough examination was undertaken of the basic outlines and overall achievements of peacekeeping operations and, in that context, renewed attention was given to the peacekeeping-peacebuilding nexus. This new approach, together with the comprehensive and forward-looking recommendations arising out of the recently completed review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture, created momentum that we hope will lead to an adequate re-evaluation of peacebuilding within overall efforts aimed at building sustainable peace. Our sincere hope is that the aforementioned exercise will result in a new appreciation of peacebuilding efforts and a readiness to deal with the issue and its financial implications in a more comprehensive and determined manner.

Croatia welcomes the PBC's attempts to play a more central role in the evolving United Nations peacebuilding agenda by improving its impact on the ground through better analysis and by galvanizing action around critical and country-specific peacebuilding priorities. The recent addition to the PBC's agenda of Liberia and Guinea, the latter being the first country added to the agenda exclusively at its own request and without a referral from the Security Council, articulately testifies to the aforementioned point.

Croatia strongly supports the Commission's efforts to develop flexible and adaptable instruments of engagement with the countries on its agenda. In that context, we particularly welcome the Commission's obvious readiness to carefully listen to the countries on its agenda and to not deliver lessons, and its choice of practical relevance over institutional independence.

The five-year review of the Commission's work, conducted under the able guidance of the three co-facilitators, the Permanent Representatives of Ireland, Mexico and South Africa, resulted in an excellent report (A/64/868, annex) containing numerous valuable assessments and recommendations. Croatia fully supports the set of recommendations to foster partnership and cooperation between the PBC and the main United Nations bodies, in particular its parent bodies, the General Assembly and the Security Council. In that context, we fully support the co-facilitators' invitation to the PBC and the Assembly to develop a more interactive and structured relationship, including their appeal to the seven Commission members elected from among the Assembly's constituency to play a bridging role in bringing about a rapprochement between it and the PBC.

Furthermore, Croatia wholeheartedly supports the proposal to organize periodic thematic debates of the General Assembly related to key thematic issues under consideration in the Commission, as well as to frame the Assembly's discussions with a view to achieving specific outcomes. In that way, six years after the Commission's inception, the Assembly could finally actualize some of its key parental rights and obligations by providing the Commission with clear guidance and advice, and by receiving the Commission's recommendations on any relevant peacebuilding issue.

I would like to take this opportunity to emphasize once again the important nexus between transitional recovery and sustainable development and, in that context, the deeply interdependent and intrinsically correlated complex agendas of the PBC and the Economic and Social Council. Accordingly, Commission members elected from among that Council's constituency should make a conscious effort to involve their fellow members in the work of the PBC and to encourage and facilitate the PBC's involvement in any peacebuilding-related issue on the agenda of the Economic and Social Council.

Furthermore, let me add that Croatia sees particular merit in the possible role of the Economic and Social Council as an appropriate facilitator of cooperation between the PBC and United Nations programmes and funds and other specialized agencies. Such efforts would be aimed at helping the Commission to better perform its basic functions.

Croatia attaches particular importance to the Commission's mandate to improve coordination among all relevant actors involved in peacebuilding efforts. In that regard, we follow with great interest and fully support the PBC's continued endeavours to strengthen partnerships with key peacebuilding actors, especially international financial institutions, in particular the World Bank, prominent regional and subregional organizations and other relevant international actors.

Croatia welcomes further improvements in communication and cross-learning among the various country-specific configurations. We commend the

dedication and commitment with which the country configuration Chairs fulfil their duties. We fully support the configurations' ongoing efforts to combine flexible and innovative approaches with solid and well-established foundations so as to better perform their designated responsibilities.

Croatia strongly supports the PBC's endeavours to identify ways to address gender issues in the core peacebuilding areas identified in the Secretary-General's report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (A/63/881). My country also supports the PBC's efforts to ensure coherence with other ongoing gender- and peacebuilding-related processes, including the identification of indicators for tracking the implementation of Security Council resolution 1325 (2000) and the review of international civilian capacities for peacebuilding.

In that regard, Croatia welcomes the recently released independent report of the Senior Advisory Group on civilian capacity in the aftermath of conflict (A/65/747). It is precisely a shortage of the civilian capacities needed to ensure sustainable peace that significantly characterizes almost all post-conflict States. We hope that the report and its valuable recommendations will help the United Nations and the international community to better meet the challenges of recruiting, training and deploying civilians with the appropriate expertise and knowledge so desperately needed in post-conflict peacebuilding.

Croatia highly values the logistical and substantive support that the Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO) is offering to the Commission and all of its configurations. At the same time, we are aware of the challenges facing the Office in carrying out its core functions.

Recognizing the PBSO's considerable efforts to organize the Peacebuilding Fund as a fast, relevant and catalytic instrument with a strong focus on programme quality and better performance reporting, Croatia supports calls for stronger synergy and improved communication between the Commission and the Fund. In that sense, we call for enhanced consultation and dialogue between the PBC and the Fund to improve their coordination in terms of the countries on the Commission's agenda and for further alignment of the Commission's instruments of engagement with the Fund's priority plans. Croatia welcomes the fact that the Fund has maintained its position as a global fund with one of the broadest donor bases of any multi-donor trust fund administered by the United Nations, and the fact that its donor base is further expanding. I confirm Croatia's strong determination to continue its financial support to the Fund.

Ms. Miranda (Peru) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation thanks you, Sir, for having organized today's joint debate. We also wish to thank Ambassador Wittig for his work, and take this opportunity to wish Ambassador Gasana every success in his efforts. My delegation endorses the statement made by the Permanent Representative of Bangladesh on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

My delegation wishes to thank the Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO) for having drafted the report of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) on its fourth session (A/65/701), in particular the section on the implementation of the recommendations arising from the review of the peacebuilding architecture, which my delegation deems to be of the greatest importance.

The annual report of the PBC comprehensively describes the activities of each configuration and their coordination and relationship with other sectors. However, the report could have been improved had it also contained an analysis section or brief analyses within each configuration of the real impact of the programmes and measures adopted and of the urgent steps required in the future. That is particularly relevant in terms of resource mobilization and development initiatives aimed at laying the foundation for economic recovery and revitalization. It is also relevant in the context of early involvement in peacebuilding efforts.

With regard to the development aspects of peacebuilding, my delegation recalls two recent Security Council debates on institution-building and on the interrelationship between security and development. It is essential for peacebuilding activities to be carried out in a long-term perspective, that it address issues of security and development in tandem, that it recognize the synergy between these two aspects, and that these activities follow the road map for implementing the recommendations arising from the PBC review process and on which the Organizational Committee has worked. In that respect, we believe that the PBC is focused more on development activities than on those related to job creation for youth.

Concerning the issues discussed in the Working Group on Lessons Learned and in the information provided on completed transactions, we see some positive examples of this approach that should be taken up, such as services related to the infrastructure as a foundation for economic recovery and support for strengthening and consolidating political institutions and reconciliation mechanisms, as well as social and judicial bodies. We need to incorporate these activities into the development aspects of the PBC, especially when they reflect the priorities determined for the use of resources from the Peacebuilding Fund. My delegation believes that the catalytic role of the Peacebuilding Commission could be further strengthened if these aspects were taken into account adequately and in depth, which should be borne in mind in the future annual report.

With regard to the report of the Secretary-General on the Peacebuilding Fund (A/65/353), while we are thankful for the drafting of this report and the increase in the available resources, we are also pleased to see progress achieved in its role as a crucial instrument for developing early peacebuilding activities and for creating transitional contexts in order to move the process of national ownership forward.

We welcome the efforts and achievements of the Immediate Response Facility designed to meet the unforeseen or urgent challenges to peacebuilding efforts. Accordingly, the delegation of Peru believes that these activities must be linked to all peacebuilding activities, early peacebuilding efforts in particular, in order to avoid duplication in the work of the United Nations and to ensure the goal of national ownership and the creation of local and national capacities.

We also note with deep interest the breakdown into sections of the four priority areas established for investments and projects of the Peacebuilding Fund, and we support the projects in these areas. It is important to bear in mind that the priorities and their different fields of action do not need to follow a fixed order and that their drafting and implementation should depend on the requirements of the country in question and on the particular characteristics of the post-conflict situation that is being addressed.

Finally, with regard to the harmonized indicators being created to improve evaluation and monitoring of activities, we believe that they should be drafted in close coordination with the various actors involved in the strategy and implementation of peacebuilding efforts, in particular United Nations agencies and stakeholders. There must be a link between the programmes supported by the Fund to establish the bases for development and the projects being developed by other agencies with the same objectives, in particular the World Bank.

Mr. Diallo (Senegal) (*spoke in French*): Senegal endorses the statement made by the representative of Bangladesh on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement, and welcomes the holding of this joint plenary debate on agenda items 30 and 109, concerning, respectively, the report of the Peacebuilding Commission (A/65/701) and the report of the Secretary-General on the Peacebuilding Fund (A/65/353). To be sure, this meeting is a timely opportunity to reassess the crucial actions of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), whose role in the peace agenda justifies the particular interest that my delegation attaches to its activities.

We agree that the mission of the PBC is not an easy one. I therefore take this opportunity to thank the outgoing Chair of the PBC, Ambassador Peter Wittig of Germany, for his leadership of that important mechanism, and to wish the new Chair, Ambassador Eugène-Richard Gasana of Rwanda, every success as he carries out his mission.

The 2010 review of the provisions of General Assembly resolution 60/180 and Security Council resolution 1645 (2005), which created the Peacebuilding Commission, enables us to study in depth the role of the PBC and the best way to play it. The review shows that the progress made to date with the countries before the Commission does not meet our expectations. This situation, while in no way tarnishing the merits and praiseworthy work of the PBC, informs us at least on one important point. Additional efforts are needed to make the PBC more effective and better able to achieve its goals. That is what it will take to ensure that it plays a role consonant with our ambitions.

Fortunately, the review of the peacebuilding architecture has identified key issues that could guide our efforts in this regard. These include improving impacts on the ground; strengthening national ownership; building partnerships with the primary stakeholders, specifically donors; better mobilization of resources; and better focus on development activities.

Furthermore, the PBC needs to fully play its advisory role by improving its cooperation with the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly, and by strengthening its links with the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. Ongoing interaction with these different bodies would provide more consistency and greater synergy that would make the PBC a genuine platform for the coordination of peacebuilding activities. Naturally, the links between the Peacebuilding Support Office and the PBC also need to be strengthened.

National ownership and capacity-building of States affected by conflict must remain at the heart of the activities of peacebuilding if we are to truly meet the needs of these countries. That is particularly necessary in that peacebuilding will be effective only if it offers them adequate capacities to recover and take charge of their own destinies. The recent independent report of the Senior Advisory Group on civilian capacity in the aftermath of conflict notes that, regrettably,

> "the international response to conflict is often supply-driven, with international actors focusing on what they can provide, rather than listening to the real needs of those they serve" (*A/65/747, p. 3*).

This alarming observation raises the question of whether demand on the ground is commensurate with available supply.

For my delegation, it is in the vigorous application of the principle of national ownership that we find a solution to the problem. Therefore, we need to ensure that planning for peacebuilding is driven by the demand side and the needs of the countries involved. This will entail, inter alia, taking into account the priorities defined by these States and the implementation of viable policies aimed at empowering national stakeholders, and young people in particular. This is how we will lay solid foundations for an effective transition from war to lasting peace. We hope that the Commission will take account of this in countries like Guinea-Bissau, where everything feels like a priority in terms of national reconstruction. Likewise, we would like to see a favourable response to Guinea's request, so that its political transition may have a better chance of success.

The question of the participation of women in peacebuilding is another major concern for my delegation. We will never achieve that momentous task unless we reverse the current trend and make women full partners in peacebuilding and not merely the innocent victims of conflicts. That can be achieved by promoting the role of women in all decision-making bodies.

It is clear that the task is indeed ambitious, but it is within our grasp if together we can show the faith and commitment this important challenge requires.

Mr. Jomaa (Tunisia) (*spoke in French*): Tunisia welcomes the convening of this debate on the fourth annual report of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) and the report of the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF), contained in documents A/65/701 and A/65/353, respectively. My delegation expresses its thanks to His Excellency Mr. Peter Wittig, Permanent Representative of Germany, for having introduced the report of the Commission on its work during its fourth session. I also take this opportunity to commend him and his team for their commitment and skill during the Commission's work last year.

Likewise, I express my gratitude to the Ambassadors of Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Jordan and Switzerland, who chaired the country-specific configurations of the Commission during the reporting period.

I should also like to commend the role of the Peacebuilding Support Office for the work it carries out every day in fulfilling its mission.

Tunisia fully endorses the statement delivered by the representative of Bangladesh on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement. At the same time, we also wish to make our own contribution to this debate.

This year, Tunisia sat on the Organizational Committee of the Peacebuilding Commission for the first time. It has been a great honour for my delegation to take part in the work of the Commission and to underscore our determination to participate actively therein, especially as this year marks the beginning of a new era for the Commission as it follows up on the outcome of the recently concluded review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture.

During the reporting period, the Peacebuilding Commission made significant and promising progress. We note with satisfaction that it has already focused efforts on a number of fundamental issues at the centre of the subsequent recommendations of the review of

the peacebuilding architecture, specifically in the areas of strengthening partnerships with major regional and international stakeholders, support for the countries on its agenda, the mobilization of resources, youth empowerment and economic recovery. We were also pleased to note that during the reporting period the Commission began focusing on a number of crucial issues, including the strengthening of national ownership and improving the impact on the ground. Drawing lessons from its initial years of activity, we are more than ever convinced that the Peacebuilding Commission is of great value and has its own place in the institutional architecture of the United Nations.

Peacebuilding and reconciliation in the aftermath of conflict must be carried out in a coordinated, coherent and comprehensive way if lasting peace is to be established. The Commission has worked hard to play this coordinating role and to cement the links between the various stakeholders. These coordination efforts should be maintained and stepped up, bringing together all political, economic and humanitarian actors at Headquarters and in the field, and civil society.

Turning to the Peacebuilding Fund, my delegation believes that this instrument has enormous potential because it can be easily adapted to the specific problems of post-conflict stabilization and recovery. While the Fund is at the disposal of the Secretariat, my delegation underscores the fact that it is up to the Assembly to give it overall guidance. With regard to its activities during the reporting period, we are pleased to note the broadening of the Fund's donor base and the growth of its portfolio, which enabled it to provide almost $63 million — a considerable increase from 20909 — to security sector reform, disarmament, demobilization and reintegration, youth employment, national reconciliation, good governance and the promotion of the rule of law. The improved quality of the Fund's programmes and the broadening of their scope are due both to new donor commitments and to improvement in its management systems.

Finally, we note that the Fund will, as of this year, begin following up on the recommendations of the review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture, in particular in the area of enhancing synergies with the Peacebuilding Commission.

Mr. Sergeyev (Ukraine): At the outset, let me express my gratitude to the former Chairperson of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), Ambassador Peter Wittig of Germany, for his comprehensive presentation of the report of the PBC on its fourth session (A/65/701). While Ukraine aligns itself with the statement of the European Union, I would like to make a few points in my national capacity.

As one can see from the presentation and the report itself, the year 2010 was not an ordinary one for the Peacebuilding Commission, with the advancement of the peacebuilding agenda across a number of areas. Among these, I would like to highlight the following.

The 2010 review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture proved to be a successful exercise in identifying its distinctive strengths and weaknesses. We commend the co-facilitators of the review for conducting a thorough and forward-looking analysis, and look forward to the early and faithful implementation of its recommendations.

Ukraine welcomes the inclusion in the PBC agenda of Liberia and, more recently, Guinea, with the subsequent emergence of new country-specific configurations. In our view, this expansion of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture, following a first direct request in the case of Guinea, is a clear indication of its relevance and the steady demand for its role on the ground. We wish the new configurations and their Chairs every success.

We are encouraged by the trend of closer cooperation between the PBC and the Security Council, with more active engagement of the Chairs of the country configurations in the Council's activities. Last week's Security Council meeting (see S/PV.6495), with the participation of the Chair of the Liberia configuration, and an informal interactive dialogue involving him and the Burundi configuration, are good examples of the evolving synergy between the two bodies, which can only be to their mutual benefit. In this regard, we see merit in extending Security Council engagement to all PBC country configurations and further exploring the most suitable and creative formats for such interaction.

All these are commendable developments that bode well for the PBC's becoming a more mature and influential body. However, we strongly support the need for further efforts to strengthen the Commission's impact in the field, to sharpen its analytical edge and to enable greater flexibility in its country-specific activities. To achieve these and other objectives,

Ukraine echoes the calls of those delegations that have urged the Commission to capitalize on the momentum generated in 2010 and have advocated for a more visible political commitment from Member States and the senior leadership of the United Nations.

Ukraine is no stranger to peacebuilding. My country has a long, solid record of contributing to United Nations peacebuilding efforts, in particular through active military, police and civilian engagement in almost 20 missions under the auspices of the United Nations. That is why Ukraine takes its membership in the PBC and our vice-chairmanship this year very seriously. As we are fully committed to strengthening the United Nations peacebuilding architecture, we support the priorities outlined by the current PBC Chair, Ambassador Eugène-Richard Gasana of Rwanda, in his inaugural statement and reconfirmed this morning. To implement them early and effectively, we deem it necessary to build on and further develop the institutional and intellectual fabric of the PBC.

There is no doubt that two foundational documents of the PBC to date are the 2010 review document (A/64/868, annex) and the road map for action in 2011. That is why Ukraine believes it is entirely appropriate that the PBC Chairpersons' work plan should be neatly tailored to the road map.

As a creation of its parent bodies, the General Assembly and Security Council, the PBC has to adopt and develop their most elaborate and sophisticated features. One of these, to our mind, is the growing thematic focus of both the Assembly and the Council. For the PBC to profit from this best practice, Ukraine suggested that the Organizational Committee explore avenues of engagement with relevant United Nations organs and dedicated entities on a number of cross-cutting issues. Among these are women's participation in peacebuilding, children in peacebuilding, youth in peacebuilding and the peacekeeping and peacebuilding nexus.

As a member of the PBC, the Economic and Social Council and UN Women, Ukraine also sees merit in considering the idea of establishing triangular institutional cooperation between these bodies, in keeping with the road map to which I have referred. We are encouraged by the support that these suggestions are enjoying in the PBC Chairs' group and look forward to meaningful follow-up on them. We stand ready to play our full part.

Finally, I would also like to add our voice in favour of strengthening the Peacebuilding Support Office as the guardian of the Commission's institutional memory.

As eloquently stated in the 2010 review document, "peacebuilding is a litmus test of our Organization and much more needs to be done collectively, if that test is to be passed" (*A/64/868, annex, para 174*). It is up to us to ensure that the Peacebuilding Commission lives up to that task.

Mr. Wang Min (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): I would like to thank Ambassador Wittig for introducing the report of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) at its fourth session (A/65/701). I also welcome the report of Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon on the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) (A/65/353). I would like to take this opportunity to thank Ambassador Wittig and his team for their hard work over the past year. I also commend the members of the country-specific configurations, the Chair of the Working Group on Lessons Learned and the members of the Peacebuilding Support Office for their efforts.

The founding of the PBC was an important moment in the reform of the United Nations. The Peacebuilding Commission has played a very important role in helping countries emerging from conflict in efforts to build peace. As indicated in the report, the PBC has made remarkable progress in its work in the five countries on its agenda. At the same time, the report also points out that the Commission faces some challenges.

Peacebuilding is a lengthy, complex and arduous task. As a young institution, established only a little over five years ago, the Commission still has a long way to go in fully and effectively implementing the mandate given to it by the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council and in achieving the goals set for it at its inception. I would like to elaborate on the following five points.

First, the United Nations should further coordinate its engagement in peacemaking, peacekeeping and peacebuilding. It is important to strengthen preventive diplomacy to alleviate instability and conflicts and reduce the demand of the international community for peacekeeping and post-conflict peacebuilding. We should make full use of the intrinsic link between peacekeeping and peacebuilding and give due attention to peacebuilding

aspects at an early stage of peacekeeping efforts so as to create favourable conditions for a smooth and seamless transition from peacekeeping to peacebuilding. At the same time, it is important to clarify the division of labour between peacekeeping and peacebuilding so as to avoid the duplication of efforts or the wasting of resources.

Secondly, the Peacebuilding Commission and relevant parties should fully respect the ownership of the host countries, focusing their support efforts on enhancing national capacity, consolidating peace, promoting reconciliation and launching socio-economic development. Host countries should assume the primary responsibility in post-conflict peacebuilding. The Commission should provide advice and assistance based on conditions set by the country concerned in determining the priorities and comprehensive strategy of post-conflict peacebuilding. We hope that the PBC will pay particular attention to addressing the underlying causes of conflict, such as poverty and the lack of governance in a country.

Thirdly, we support the continued strengthening of coordination between the PBC and the main bodies of the United Nations, such as the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council. It should also strengthen cooperation with international and regional organizations outside of the United Nations system, so as to complement each other's comparative advantages and thus improve the effective of their work. We encourage the Commission to provide relevant advice to the Security Council on peacebuilding and to strengthen its communication with international financial institutions, such as the World Bank, regional organizations and the private sector so as to facilitate greater contributions to post-conflict peacebuilding.

Fourthly, while the PBC has made progress in improving its working methods and the efficiency of its work, there is still room for improvement. There is a need to gather its experiences and lessons and compile best practices. Its Organizational Committee and its country-specific configurations should streamline their meetings, increase their focus and ensure the quality of their meetings. At present, there are six countries on the PBC agenda. The PBC should therefore concentrate its efforts on achieving concrete results in its peacebuilding work in those countries.

Fifthly, the Peacebuilding Fund has played an active role in supporting the peacebuilding efforts of countries emerging from conflict. Remarkable progress has been made. China welcomes the further improvement in the management of the PBF, its project approval and implementation, the strengthening of its performance management provisions and its increased communication with the PBC so as to maximize its utilization of resources.

We call on more countries to contribute to the PBF and encourage the PBC to play its part as a resource-mobilization platform, including through its permanent relationship with the World Bank and other international financial institutions.

China supports the work of the PBC and the PBF. Since 2007, China has contributed $4 million to the PBF. This year and next year, we will continue to do so by contributing $2 million. As always, China will continue to contribute to United Nations peacekeeping efforts.

Mr. Rai (Nepal): Let me begin by expressing my delegation's sincere appreciation to you, Mr. President, for having organized this joint debate on the annual report of the Peacebuilding Commission (A/65/701) and the Secretary-General's report on the Peacebuilding Fund (A/65/353). I also express our appreciation to the Secretary-General and to the former Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission, Ambassador Wittig, for presenting these reports. We are confident that this joint debate will serve as a way to meaningfully engage a broader number of Member States in the activities of the Peacebuilding Commission and the Peacebuilding Fund. I align my delegation with the statement delivered by the representative of Bangladesh on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

The Peacebuilding Commission was established as a dedicated institutional mechanism to address the special needs of countries emerging from conflict in terms of recovery, reintegration and reconstruction, and to assist them in laying a foundation for sustainable development. The experience to date in the countries on its agenda has amply justified its founding logic and the value of such a dedicated intergovernmental body providing much-needed technical, developmental and financial support to these countries.

Building peace after conflict requires coordinated multifaceted efforts and sufficient investment. We

cannot emphasize enough the importance of partnership among the Peacebuilding Commission, international financial institutions, regional and subregional organizations and other relevant international actors in harmonizing their support and pooling their resources for effective peacebuilding activities on the ground. The strategic development framework must be prepared with wider consultation so as to ensure a better reflection of national priorities. The report rightly focuses on the need for a single, overall planning document, around which all international support must revolve.

Broader political consensus and commitment to the peace process must be underlined and given sufficient focus in any peacebuilding activities. Following the stabilization of the security situation, restoring basic services, establishing and strengthening essential public institutions, preparing for elections and implementing quick-impact projects in critical areas are some of the early peacebuilding efforts that would greatly help ensure local people's continued support for peacebuilding activities. The mainstreaming of women, marginalized groups and young people should be important and integral components of all peacebuilding processes.

Capacity-building is key to ensuring national ownership. No matter how difficult the situation is, the Peacebuilding Commission must keep national ownership front and centre in its activities in the field. This is the only way to ensure that the peacebuilding process is driven by national actors in a sustainable manner; indeed, it is essential for the success of the Peacebuilding Commission and for its timely exit from the field.

As mentioned in the report, synergy between the Peacebuilding Commission and the Peacebuilding Fund must be ensured for effective and efficient financing and for maximum impact on the ground in the implementation of targeted projects. We would like to see a substantial increase in support to the Peacebuilding Fund so that sufficient funding can be made available for peacebuilding activities in a timely and predictable manner.

It is good to note that the President of the Security Council has continued to extend invitations to the Chairs of the country configurations to brief the Council. These invitations to the Council's periodic considerations of the situations of and mandates involving the countries on the Commission's agenda should be continued and further strengthened to enhance the coherence and effectiveness of peace consolidation work.

The Working Group on Lessons Learned must be fully utilized as a platform for the distillation of pragmatic knowledge for the benefit of country configurations and the wider peacebuilding community. Nepal had the opportunity to chair the Working Group during 2010. We believe that better follow up and stronger integration of the findings relating to peacebuilding activities could help enhance our effectiveness on the ground.

Ms. Rulumeni (South Africa): We thank you, Mr. President, for having organized this joint debate. Today's joint debate on the report (A/65/701) of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) and the Secretary-General's report on the Peacebuilding Fund (A/65/353) presents an important opportunity for us to take stock with a view to consolidating gains and identifying challenges in the implementation of peacebuilding activities.

South Africa wishes to express its sincere thanks to Ambassador Wittig for his efforts and dedication. We also extend our gratitude to the Chairs of the five country-specific configurations. We are also pleased to learn that there is already growing momentum to take forward the recommendations of the report (A/64/868, annex) of the co-facilitators, namely, the representatives of Ireland, Mexico and South Africa, on the 2010 review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture within the platform of the Peacebuilding Commission.

The Peacebuilding Commission has made a significant contribution to United Nations peacebuilding efforts since it was established, six years ago. The five countries currently on its agenda have benefited in various ways, including through assistance provided under the Peacebuilding Fund and programmes.

The recent addition of Liberia to the Commission's agenda, on 16 September 2010, and the admission of Guinea is yet another indication of the significance of the work of the Commission. We have also witnessed growing interest from Member States choosing to assist and be associated with peacebuilding activities. However, more still needs to be done on the

implementation side and my delegation believes that there is huge scope for improvement in that regard.

Turning to the reports before us, it is my delegation's view that the annual report of the PBC is comprehensive, factual and gives a full account of the activities of the PBC as concretely carried out over the past year. However, South Africa believes that the Peacebuilding Commission could improve its reporting by also reflecting more on the following areas.

The report should focus on further enhancing cooperation and information sharing. For example, lessons learned should be shared between the General Assembly, the Security Council and other United Nations bodies such as the Economic and Social Council and the United Nations Development Programme. The report should therefore necessarily focus on the effective utilization of the Working Group on Lessons Learned. The Group could contribute added value by providing guidance and insight to potential candidates for addition to the PBC agenda.

It should also focus on the lack of close coordination between all stakeholders, including by promoting greater consideration of women and civil society in peacebuilding, leadership and development issues. The report could also focus more on the Commission's interaction with regional and subregional organizations and the international financial institutions, which have a dynamic role to play in promoting peace and security in the region, as well as on socio-economic development.

With regard to the Peacebuilding Fund, I will limit my remarks to two key specific issues. First, with regard to the Fund's interaction with the Peacebuilding Commission, my delegation believes that the existing complementarities between the Peacebuilding Commission and Peacebuilding Fund should be sustained and maintained. As financial contributions from the donor community are shrinking due to the global financial meltdown, it will be necessary for the Peacebuilding Fund to take stock of its activities with a view to prioritizing the limited resources in order to maximize the benefits. Among other considerations, good governance and accountability are often used as preconditions for funding by the donor community — an approach that at times leads to delays in the implementation of peacebuilding initiatives. We therefore appeal to the international community to look again at this approach, with the understanding that countries emerging from conflict face unique challenges that cannot be overcome in a short period of time.

The Peacebuilding Support Office, in partnership with the United Nations system, adds enormous value to peacebuilding efforts. However, it continues to face challenges of limited expertise and resources. If these considerable challenges are addressed, the role of the Peacebuilding Support Office in providing assistance to the Peacebuilding Commission could produce even better results.

In conclusion, it is our sincere hope that the roll-out strategy for the peacebuilding road map on the PBC Chair's proposal for taking forward the recommendations of the report of the co-facilitators would add value not only by enhancing the work of Peacebuilding Commission but also by improving coordination and relations between the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly.

Mr. Goledzinowski (Australia): Australia is taking the floor as a country committed to the work of peacebuilding. Some of the most difficult but important work that we can do today is centred around peacebuilding and the work of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC). We appreciated our term of office as a member of the Organizational Committee in 2010, and intend to remain closely engaged with the work of the Peacebuilding Commission through the activities of the country-specific configurations.

The 2010 annual report (A/65/701), before us today, demonstrates the evolution that this body has undergone over the past 18 months, including under the able leadership of Germany as Chair of the Commission.

We believe the PBC is now entering a very important period, partly because of the changes associated with implementing the recommendations of the five-year review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture. I think all of us agree that we need a PBC that is more relevant, more flexible, empowered and better understood, but, most important, more ambitious than the one we have today.

It is also an important period because of the innovations that are being undertaken in the context of peacebuilding, including in the Liberia configuration

through the new streamlined mechanisms, which emphasize alignment with national priorities.

It is also an exciting time because the delegation of Rwanda is assuming its position as Chair of the Organizational Committee this year. That delegation's experience, perspectives and moral authority will make a difference.

Finally, in this context, the civilian capacity review is an interesting new challenge for us to take into account in our consideration of peacebuilding activities in general.

During our time as a member of the Organizational Committee, we learned lessons about peacebuilding and how it is done within the United Nations system. I would like to briefly touch on three of these, which are also highlighted in the annual report and which we see as key to the way in which the Commission goes forward with its work.

The first — and I acknowledge that a number of delegations have touched on this — is the importance of strengthening our relationship with other peacebuilding actors. We strongly believe in a deeper and more structured relationship between the PBC and regional actors such as the African Union and other African institutions. This is absolutely critical in how we go forward. One very obvious example is that of drug trafficking, which is a threat to peace in many West African countries, and one which requires a regional approach.

We also emphasize, as others have done, the importance of deepening the relationship between the PBC and the international financial institutions, in particular the World Bank. We also need to work more closely with civil society, including as part of its broad role as a focal point for peacebuilding efforts for all relevant players, drawing together and disseminating information on challenges, lessons learned and best practices. We encourage efforts to increase the synergies between the PBC and the international dialogue on peacebuilding and State-building.

There are two other important actors, namely, the Secretariat and the Security Council. In terms of the United Nations system, we agree with the comments made by the Ambassador of Rwanda, who highlighted the critical role that the Secretary-General himself can play in ensuring system-wide coherence and encouraging stronger links between the PBC, on the one hand, and the agencies, funds and programmes and Secretariat departments, on the other, in peacebuilding operations.

The other actor I mentioned was the Security Council. Again, others, such as the representative of Ukraine, have mentioned the need for a deeper, more organic and more structured relationship between the PBC and the Security Council. We acknowledge the value of the interactive dialogue that has taken place and urge that more be done in that regard. But in our view, the Security Council needs to be more open in its engagement with the Peacebuilding Commission, including in areas where perhaps not enough has been done. One area that comes to mind is the question of mandates of peacekeeping missions, which, after all, is where peacebuilding starts — we have said that so many times — and where the Peacebuilding Commission has value to add.

The second lesson that Australia learned was the importance of reinforcing national ownership and capacity. This is something that it is easy to pay lip service to, but it can be very difficult to achieve in practice. We strongly support the g7+ forum of fragile and conflict-affected countries and regions, reflecting our strong conviction that peacebuilding goals should be set at the country level. In that regard, we support improving the alignment of the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) with national peacebuilding priorities as identified by the PBC and country agendas.

The third issue that I think emerges very strongly in the annual report is that of resource mobilization. Mobilizing resources is just one of the roles of the PBC, but it is an important one for bringing partners together in a way that will support the critical work that we need to undertake. Resource mobilization is clearly an area where the Commission can intensify its efforts. We have a collective responsibility to ensure that the PBC deliver in this regard.

We are also here to discuss the report on the Peacebuilding Fund (A/65/353), on which I will say a few words. Australia has committed $7 million to the PBF since its inception, and we will continue to be engaged as a donor. In addition, we have also contributed direct assistance to peacebuilding activities in Sierra Leone this year and for the Burundi elections in 2010.

We note that the allocation under the new Fund grew substantially in 2009 and 2010, supporting more

than double the number of countries than during the Fund's first year. This has also allowed for rapid growth in the number of projects, but that growth has not been matched by the same level of growth in the funding of the Fund. We encourage the continued increase in the number of projects and believe it to be a very positive sign of the way in which the PBF is working. However, it is important that the quality of support provided not be compromised. That will of course require additional and adequate resources.

Measuring the effectiveness of peacebuilding operations is another problem. It is in fact very difficult and we have yet to work out how to do so. We support the plans, as outlined in the report, to develop a harmonized system of indicators for the Fund. We also support the use of a gender scoring system within the harmonized indicators as a way of ensuring that we are meeting the objectives that we have set for ourselves in that regard.

Finally, we look forward to hearing from the countries receiving support from the Fund on their views of the Fund's management arrangements and impact, both now and on a regular basis. If we are not meeting their needs, then the Fund is not fulfilling the purpose we have set for it.

Mr. Moraes Cabral (Portugal): Allow me to thank the Permanent Representatives of Germany and Rwanda for their contributions to our debate. I would also like to commend the Chairs of the country-specific configurations for their commitment and leadership. Portugal of course shares the positions that the Ambassador of Hungary has presented on behalf of the European Union.

We welcome the report (A/65/701) of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) and its comprehensive overview of activities, especially those of the various country configurations. The recent creation of a country-specific configuration for the Republic of Guinea is a clear testament to the success of the PBC as an important platform for international support for the transition of post-conflict societies towards durable peace.

Portugal strongly supports an approach to international assistance that takes into account the relationship between security and development. Ensuring that those two dimensions are treated in an integrated manner from the early stages of peacekeeping requires bringing our political, development, security and humanitarian instruments under a single consistent framework. In each of the countries where it has evolved, the PBC is certainly an important part of the United Nations efforts to devise such a framework.

In our view, the present report provides an accurate account of how the peacebuilding agenda has gradually become an integral part of the United Nations work for peace, security and development. At the same time, it points out a number of challenges that need to be addressed in the future. Allow me to focus on some of the challenges that, in our view, deserve particular attention.

First, in spite of the progress documented in the annual report, there is certainly room for improvement in the coordination and joint work between the PBC and other actors present on the ground. There is a growing perception in the international community of the PBC as a catalyst for the mobilization of donor resources, the identification of financing gaps and the setting of priorities for international assistance. However, there is a need to transfer that perception to the actual work being carried out on the ground.

Aside from the regular planning and articulation with national authorities, in our view, the PBC should be more consistently involved with other actors early on, first and foremost with United Nations agencies, but also with bilateral partners, international financial institutions and regional organizations. That would greatly benefit the efficiency of its endeavours and those of the international community as a whole. We note with satisfaction that this issue is one of the main aspects of the PBC road map for actions in 2011.

Secondly, there is a clear trend that the PBC is becoming more engaged with what the report calls the developmental aspects of peacebuilding and economic revitalization. In the light of what I just said about the nexus between security and development, we believe this to be a positive development that should be encouraged in future reviews of priority plans. In particular, I would underline those actions promoted by the PBC aimed at addressing the problem of youth employment. Youth unemployment, especially in West Africa, has serious destabilizing potential, and local actors have little capacity to promote greater access to the labour market. However, PBC engagement in that area requires more consistent dialogue with development agencies so as to promote a peacebuilding

approach to what should be a priority in the countries on the PBC agenda.

Finally, we should ensure greater flexibility and adaptability of the PBC mechanisms, especially as regards its relations with the Peacebuilding Fund. The advantage of being a relatively new institution is that it should be able to react and adapt more quickly than other institutions to evolving situations in each of the countries covered. In order to do so, Portugal believes that the PBC would greatly benefit from stronger synergies with the Security Council.

I wish to conclude by saying that Portugal actively participates in three of the country-specific configurations. We look forward to participating in the Guinea configuration. We strongly believe in the PBC's added value in contributing to more efficient and integrated action by the international community throughout the various post-conflict and peacebuilding stages in the countries involved. In our view, the success of the PBC in fulfilling its functions represents our collective success in efforts towards achieving sustainable peace.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.